



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/632,924	08/04/2003	Shuar Jiun Chong	CHON3002/EM	4932

23364 7590 09/09/2005

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC  
625 SLATERS LANE  
FOURTH FLOOR  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

ELLIS, KEVIN L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2188

DATE MAILED: 09/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/632,924

Applicant(s)

CHONG ET AL.

Examiner

Kevin L. Ellis

Art Unit

2188

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 8-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6 and 7 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.  |

**Detailed Action**

1. Claims 1-11 are presented for examination.

***Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-5 and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Friel et al., U.S. Patent Application 2003/0158614.

A) As to claim 1, Friel et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed. There is a storage device using SDRAM (¶ 18), data transmission converting interface (see Fig 5 Ref 103), memory storing/retrieving controller (Fig 5 Ref 104), at least one SDRAM (Fig 5 Ref 120), and a SDRAM controller (Fig 5 Ref 122). However, Friel et al. does not disclose the use of buffers to temporarily store the data from the data transmission converting interface. The use of buffers in connecting various components of semiconductor systems together was common knowledge. The temporary buffers would allow efficient transfer of data and matching of transfer rates between the different components of the system. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that temporary buffers could be utilized in the system of Friel et al. for the reasons stated above.

- B) As to claim 2, the server can be a computer (§ 42).
- C) As to claims 3 and 4, the system of Friel et al. does disclose connecting to the server by way of a wireless interface. It would have also been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the system of Friel et al. could also be provided with a wired interface for connection to the computer (i.e. ethernet, USB, etc). This would provide a more secure means of data transfer and a way to transfer data to the system without worry about radio interference problems.
- D) As to claim 5, the system of Friel et al. does provide for the reading out of data from the SDRAM memory. Friel et al. disclose a two-way radio communication with the system (§ 42).
- E) As to claims 8 and 9, the limitations of these claims have been addressed above with respect to claims 3 and 4 and the rejection applies here as well.
- F) As to claim 10, Friel et al. does not specifically disclose the use of DDR SDRAM. It was common knowledge in the art that DDR SDRAM provides higher data transfer rates than regular (i.e. SDR) SDRAM. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that DDR SDRAM could be utilized in the system of Friel et al., an advantage to this would be the higher data transfer rate which would mean it would take less time to store music into the system.
- G) As to claim 11, the system of Friel et al. does have a power management module (see Fig 5 Ref 108).

*Allowable Claims*

4. Claims 6 and 7 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

*Conclusion*

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin L. Ellis whose telephone number is 571-272-4205. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays from 6:00AM-2:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mano Padmanabhan can be reached on 571-272-4210. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Kevin L. Ellis  
Primary Examiner  
September 4, 2005

